

REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1-5,7-9, 14, 16-17, 19-23, 25-27, 32 and 34-35 under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai (US 6,952,804) in view of TM-1300 progressive scan high resolution camera operations manual

Independent claims 1 and 19 have been amended to more clearly specify that the video program is received in a high-quality data-compressed format, for which it is unnecessary to produce copies that need to be further data-compressed in order to facilitate the editing processes.

The Kumagai reference discloses a video supply device and method that include network I/Fs (37), (38) for transmitting/receiving a video to an external network, a high-quality video server (32) for storing the video as a regular editing video, a high-compressed video streamer (35) for storing the video as a rough editing video, a high-compressed video server (31) for reading out and transmitting the rough editing video on the basis of a video transmission request from a production (51) included in the external network (20), and a high-quality video server (32) for extracting and transmitting a part of the regular editing video to a post production (40) on the basis of the result of editing processing from the production (51). The system is directed at solving the following problems: transmitting high-quality "work prints" of program materials over a network to: first, facilitate development of an EDL (Edit Decision List) on an editing system external to the video providing device (30), and second, for the purpose of Client reviews. The Kumagai reference discloses that the solution to the deficiencies in the prior art are provided by receiving the original program materials in a high-quality format, and then storing the program materials in two versions: 1) a high-quality version (to be used to produce the final edited program), and also 2) a lower-quality, highly-compressed version (to be used to create the

EDL and for client review) which is more readily transported over the network to the external editing systems and client review facilities. It is clear from Figure 2 that the high-quality version incurs minimal processing, while only the high-compression version is subjected to data compression in the MPEG Encoder (34).

Claims 1 and 19 as amended include the limitation that the data that is compressed in an original format and does not include multiple formats as disclosed in the Kumagai reference. In contrast, the instant invention specifies the use of a different compression technique that obviates the need for maintaining two separate copies of the program material. In the instant invention, the original version is used for all purposes.

The Examiner has cited the TM-1300 manual (in combination with Kumagai) as evidence of “transmitting/outputting a progressive-scanned video onto a network through an RS-422 digital output interface at constant frame rate of only 12 fps”, and further notes that “an RS-422 interface has a data rate of 10 Mbps”, or, alternatively, “has a data rate between 200K to 6Mbps ... therefore the TM-1300 CCD camera inherently outputs a video stream at a data rate between 200K to 6Mbps”.

However, Page 31 of the TM-1300 manual specifies that both the pixel clock and the data clock operate at 20 MHz, which suggests an actual data rate of 20 Mbps. The RS-422 standard states (Page 1, Col. 2) that “... the controlling factors in a voltage digital interface are: 1) the cable length; 2) the data signaling rate, ...”. Extrapolating the graph in Figure 3 to 20 Mbps results in a cable length restriction of 20 feet. Thus, it would appear that the TM-1300 is “overdriving” the RS-422 interface and operating it at twice the recommended maximum data signaling rate.

The combination of Kumagai and TM-1300 manual does not teach data compressed in an original format and at a rate of less than substantially 24 fps as specified in claims 1 and 19. For the foregoing reasons, the combination of Kumagai and TM-13000 manual does not teach each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 19 and does not establish a case of prima facie obviousness. (See MPEP section 2131) Similarly, dependant claims 2-5, 7-9, 14, 16-17, 20-23, 25-27, 32 and 34-35 are also not obvious in view of the above combinations. Withdrawal of the above rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 13, 29 under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai (US 6,952,804) in view of TM-1300 progressive scan high resolution camera operations manual in further view of Anand (US 6,920,179)

The Kumagai and TM-1300 references were discussed above and are not repeated here. The examiner is citing the Anand reference for the teaching of varying the frame rate “in response to externally or operated [*sic*] generated commands”. The Anand reference discloses a heterogeneous network over which a video signal is transmitted in a progressive coded video stream, with “progressive” here referring to a signal in which the level of detail in a frame is increased as the image data is received and accumulated. As such, the data rate and thus the frame rate is reduced by discarding data that is part of the original video program data. As stated above, claims 1 and 19 include the limitation that the data that is compressed is in an original format and does not include multiple formats or modifications. Therefore, the combination of Kumagai, TM-1300 and Anand does not disclose nor teach each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 19, and does not establish a case of prima facie obviousness. (See MPEP section 2131) Similarly dependant claims 13, 19 are also not obvious in view of the above combinations. Withdrawal of the above rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 6, 24 under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai (US 6,952,804) in view of TM-1300 progressive scan high resolution camera operations manual in further view of Jain (US 6,144,375)

The Kumagai and TM-1300 references were discussed above and are not repeated here. The examiner is citing the Jain reference for the teaching of an editing system offering facilities for "frame-by-frame control, including variable, bi-directional playback. The Jain reference discloses a method and apparatus for interactively viewing a real-world environment. The viewer includes a user interface having a first window for displaying a two-dimensional representation of a three-dimensional model of the real world environment. The viewer further includes a plurality of other viewing areas for displaying and querying for views of the real-world environment. The viewer includes a content-based event timeline that graphically depicts multi-media events satisfying user queries. When the user selects an event, the viewer displays all of the multi-media information including audio/video and textual information that is associated with the selected event. There is no teaching in the Jain reference of a digital video system that includes data compressed in an original format with a constant frame rate of less than substantially 24 fps and maintained in the original format. Therefore, the combination of Kumagai, TM-1300 and Jain does not disclose nor teach each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 19, and does not establish a case of prima facie obviousness. (See MPEP section 2131) Similarly dependant claims 6, 24 are also not obvious in view of the above combinations. Withdrawal of the above rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 10, 15, 18, 28, 33, 36 under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumagai (US 6,952,804) in view of TM-1300 progressive scan high resolution camera operations manual in further view of Esbensen (US 7,124,427)

The Kumagai and TM-1300 references were discussed above and are not repeated here.

The examiner is citing the Esbensen reference for the teaching of multiple windows for displaying, and controlling, multiple video sources. The Esbensen reference discloses methods and apparatus for an image server surveillance system. Various structures are disclosed and include: multiple frame grabbers that include one or more cameras, one or more camera coordinators, a camera server and one or more clients for displaying images delivered by the server. There is no teaching in the Esbensen reference of a digital video system that includes data compressed in an original format with a constant frame rate of less than substantially 24 fps and maintained in the original format. Therefore, the combination of Kumagai, TM-1300 and Esbensen does not disclose nor teach each and every limitation of Claims 1 and 19, and does not establish a case of prima facie obviousness. (See MPEP section 2131) Similarly dependant claims 10, 15, 18, 28, 33, 36 are also not obvious in view of the above combinations.

Withdrawal of the above rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is argued that the present amendment places all of the claims in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney if doing so would advance prosecution of this case.

Application No. 10/664,244
Amendment dated June 15, 2010
Reply to Office Action of December 16, 2009

13

Docket No.: FNI-02902/03

Dated: June 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Kevin S. MacKenzie/

Kevin S. MacKenzie

Registration No.: 45,639

GIFFORD, KRASS, SPRINKLE, ANDERSON
& CITKOWSKI, P.C.

2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330

Post Office Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(248) 647-6000

(248) 647-5210 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant